

Maryland Commission on Climate Change
Mitigation Working Group Meeting Minutes
June 5, 2015 from 10:00 am – 12:00 pm
Maryland Department of Transportation Headquarters

Working Group Members in Attendance: Stuart Clarke, Town Creek Foundation; Mike Powell, Private Sector Representative; George Aburn, MDE; Drew Cobbs, API; Tom Ballentine, NAIOP Real Estate Development; Tom Dennison, SMECO; Tom Weissinger, Raven Power; Arjun Makhijani, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research; Rebecca Ruggles, Maryland Environmental Health Network; Jim Strong, United Steelworkers; Don Halligan, MDOT; Fred Docca, UMD; Zoe Johnson, DNR; Joe Uehlein, Labor Network for Stability; Andrea Mansfield, MAC; Colby Ferguson, Maryland Farm Bureau

On Phone: Ben Hobbs, JHU; Andrew Tellers, UMD; Lynn Heller, Abell Foundation; Mike Remsberg, Trinity Consultants; Melanie Santiago-Mosier, Sun Edison

Absent: Alice Kennedy, Maryland Municipal League; Jana Davis, Chesapeake Bay Trust; Mike Tidwell, Chesapeake Climate Action Network; Gerrit Knaap, National Center for Smart Growth; Kevin Lucas, MEA; Susan Payne, MDA; Mia Davis, MWCOG; Anne Lindner, Exelon; R. Daniel Wallace, Bith Energy

Others in Attendance: Howard Simons, MDOT; Jason Dubow, MDP; Brian Hug, MDE; Lorenzo Bellamy, AF & PA; Heather Murphy, MDOT; Sara Tomilson, Balto Metro; Jim Frazier, MBaker; Luke Wisniewski, MDE; Will Drew, Capital Strategies; Jim Doyle; Caroline Varney-Alvarado, DHCD; Colin Jones, MDA; Ellen Bast, RESI; Chris Rice, MEA; David Jackson, Cambridge System Inc.; Colleen Turner, MBaker; Betsy Atkinson, MD Env Health Network; Dairamani Sivasailam, MWCOG; Liz Entwisle, MDE; James McGary, CCN; Gabe Pacyniak, GCC; Doug Vine, C2ES; David Costello; Christine Krone, SMWPA; Stephen Walz, MWCOG; Tim Shepard, MDE; Candace Donoho, MML; Todd Lang, BaltoMetro

I. Introduction

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 am. Stuart Clarke opened the meeting by thanking everyone for their participation and invited each person in the room to identify themselves. He stated that the purpose of the MWG meeting was to provide basic information as a prelude to other informational sub-group meetings. There will be subsequent opportunities to discuss all programs. He requested that presentations be made available prior to all future meetings. Mike Powell stated the importance of the sub-group meetings. The MWG will make key decisions, but will provide guidance to sub-groups who ultimately provide the content for the reports.

No attendees had questions, additions, or amendments to the agenda.

II. Dashboard (Programs progress update)

Tad opened the discussion by reminding the group of the timelines and offered to accept any requests and recommendations in writing at anytime.

Brian showed the status of the progress of MDE, DNR, & MEA with the “dashboard” figure. The “dashboard” will be the format used to display progress at all future meetings. Brian answered a question about the projections being for 2015 or 2020. The projections are for 2020.

III. Other Business

Stuart informed the MWG that there will be another sub-committee to address some questions that arose during the MEA program update. There will be a more structured and more detailed explanation of the MEA programs and the energy sector at a 2nd sub-committee meeting.

Lynn Heller mentioned that Peter Boo of the GBC requested that net-zero buildings be added to a future meeting agenda. Perhaps a net-zero buildings by 2030 goal should be discussed?

Tad introduced the next agenda item(s): MDOT and MDP Program Updates

IV. Implementation of GGRA Programs Assigned to MDOT

Don Halagan welcomes Howard Simons to present progress and proceeds to frame MDOT as an umbrella organization and details all of the other modal organizations that MDOT oversees (i.e BWI, SHA, DMV, MVA, MTA, Port of Baltimore, etc.)

Howard Simons presents the GGRA programs assigned to MDOT. (See presentation on [MCCC website](#)). Presents six of MDOT's goals, and details the content of the three of main documents that MDOT produces.

The projected emission reductions from the MDOT programs falls between the Initial (?) and Enhanced projections (?) at about 13.4 MMtons by 2020.

Question: What is an example of off-road? Construction equipment – measures to reduce idling.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

- No significant increase or decrease between years 2004-2014.
- VMT per capita has decreased which is a good measure of success. Examples of programs that decrease per capita VMT are Clean Cars, tele-working, Land Use as well as economic/market factors
- Reducing VMT does not significantly decrease GHG
- To reduce GHG by 1 MMton in 2020 we'd need to reduce VMT by 3.5% 10 MMton decrease would require a 33% decrease in VMT
- Correlation between VMT and GHG is decreasing
- 44% of the programs in the Maryland CTP are "GHG favorable" meaning there are GHG reductions associated with the capital projects.

Capital Projects

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires a GHG analysis of all capital projects
- Modeling tools have changed (MOBILE to MOVES2014)
- Funding is always changing
- Bike/Ped considered in every project

VMT-related Emission Reductions

- Baseline is changing: 1.1% vs. 1.8% growth rate: this indicates significant changes
- Takes a lot to move the baseline
- Need to balance the impact of market forces and economic factors on decreased VMT
- Market forces are big drivers when considering adjusting baselines for planning
- Red/Purple line would only reduce GHG by about 0.8 MMton (not significant)

- Fleet turnover will have biggest impact
- “Total emissions model” is the best way to analyze GHG emissions reductions

Question: Should the baseline be adjusted per the MPO growth rate? MPOs are projections based on historical data. Adjusting the baseline given the recent economic contributors makes this adjustment complex and challenging. Mike Powell asked if the local programs are included. Answer is Yes.

Tad suggested that the specific questions be addressed in a sub-group meeting on the Transportation Sector. A follow-up session is necessary. He also proposed discussing the long-term reduction potential from the Transportation sector. More modeling is necessary to see what 2035 will bring.

Rebecca requested a follow-up session to discuss how the GHG reductions are calculated for large transit projects (red/purple line). Also need to determine the best way to get more EVs in the fleet and calculate the benefit of retiring again gas-powered cars in fleet. Best “bang-for-the-buck”.

V. Implementation of GGRA Programs Assigned to MDP

Jason Dubow from MDP presented slides (see [MCCC website](#) for presentation) on programs assigned to MDP. In summary the progress is between Initial and Enhanced at 0.64 MMton. Currently at 75% progress (2015) so no additional enhancements are required to meet enhanced GGRA goal.

- Smart Growth is a long-term effort
- Location efficiency is key to success and GHG reductions
- Note: MD’s population has increased by 1 million people every year for the last 20 years and will probably continue to do so
- Significant effort required just to off-set growth
- Only 1 of 2 of the MDP programs were defined as needing enhancements in the GGRA
- MDP believes the 2020 goal will be met without enhancements
- Economic analysis indicates significant benefit from Smart Growth programs
- Location efficiency is not well-captured by the Transportation models
- Additional metrics are needed to measure potential reductions from location efficiency

Maryland Climate Change Commission (MCCC) must decide where to focus effort relative to Smart Growth and for 2020 and beyond. It’s up to the MWG must be careful to consider both government costs and private sector costs/benefit

Question: Should a sub-group be established to look closely at the 75% compact development goal. Maryland is currently on-track, but this may not be sustainable. Development has shifted to multi-family and the trend will probably continue. Perhaps building permits may be useful for tracking this?

Tad concluded the Q/A session with a comment that Maryland needs a chart like California developed for the Climate Scoping Plan (Slide 6 of MDP presentation).

VI. Overview of GGRA Report and the Commission Report Format / Table of Contents

Purpose of the color-coded document: 1) internal planning 2) prepare for next MCCC meeting. We’ll need sign-off on structure and format of report.

Red text: these are complicated. Partnerships with RESI, NESCAUM, DNR, UMD already in place, but MDE will need more outside assistance.

Key requirements for the GGRA Report (Required by statute)

- MDE needs updated data from all agencies (June deadline)
- MDE needs RESI to complete economic analysis (cost data)
- Emerging Technology – MDE will need support
- Legislative Priorities – MDE will need to walk General Assembly through the recommendations for 2020 and future goals
- Federal Actions - 111(d) - We are currently working through this
- Multi-Pollutant Project - completing final stages of the Project
- Manufacturing Study - completed. No significant impact from GGRA on sector

There is over-lap between the GGRA report and MCCC report. The MCCC has access to GGRA report for use in the MCCC report. MDE can use support from the MCCC on economic analysis and Chapter 4 – Summary of Reductions.

Key requirements for the MCCC Report

- Must focus on the requirements outlined in the Executive Order
- MCCC has flexibility (compared to GGRA report)
- Note: MCCC and Steering committee have yet to see/comment on Format/TOC of MCCC report
- Sub-groups will advise full-commission on TOC. How should this be communicated? Forum?
- **Next opportunity to discuss is 6/19 MDOT sub-group meeting**
- **Joint MWG meeting 6/24 – State of Science (MDE, UMD)**

Stuart proposed at least four additional sub-group meetings

- MEA program in more detail
- MDE programs in more detail
- Economic Analysis
- Beyond 2020

VI. Adjourn

Question: Drew Hobbs (phone): Do we need more stakeholders from non-stationary sources?

Response: This will need further discussion.

Question: How much of the progress that we are seeing in the Dashboard slides can be attributed to market forces? Can we differentiate?

Response: It's too difficult to tease out. The GGRA plan includes state actions and these are driven by market forces. State programs and market forces will get to 2020 goal. The current analysis is only a "snapshot". This is a question that can be answered in the MCCC report - not the GGRA report.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 pm by MWG co-chairs.